



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/728,356	12/03/2003	Peter A. Panec	GCENP004	6402
22434	7590	09/30/2005	EXAMINER	
BEYER WEAVER & THOMAS LLP			ZHONG, CHAD	
P.O. BOX 70250			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
OAKLAND, CA 94612-0250			2152	

DATE MAILED: 09/30/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/728,356	PANEC ET AL.
	Examiner Chad Zhong	Art Unit 2152

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 23 August 2005.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-67 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:  
  1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)  | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____  |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>7/15/05</u> | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
|  | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

**FINAL ACTION**

1. This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 08/23/2005. This action has been made final.
2. Claims 1-67 are presented for examination in Amendment filed on 08/23/2005:  
Claims 1-8, 13, 17-19, 21, 23, 26-30, 35, 39, 42-49, 54, 58-60, 62-65 and 67 have been amended.  
Claims 9-12, 14-16, 20, 22, 24-25, 31-34, 36-38, 40-41, 50-53, 55-57, 61, and 66 are previously presented.
3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim 1-67 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112, second paragraph***

Claims 63, 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

- a. The following terms lack antecedent basis:
  - i. the computer readable product - claim 63, 65, i.e. does the Applicant mean "the computer program product" ?

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102***

4. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(e) the invention was described in a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent, or on an international application by another who has fulfilled the requirements of paragraphs (1), (2), and (4) of section 371 (c) of this title before the invention thereof by the applicant for patent.

Art Unit: 2152

5. Claims 1-23, 25-46, 47, 48-64, 66-67 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Ims et al. (hereinafter Ims), US 2002-0091533.

6. As per claim 1, Ims teaches a method for correlating services within a computer network, the method comprising:

providing a message interchange network for exchanging application-level messages between services, the message interchange network managing a plurality of services which are each accessible by a plurality of services ([0033]; [0068-0069]); and

tracking correlation information regarding each application level message received into message interchange network, wherein the application level messages are being sent between pairs of the services, wherein the correlation information for each message pertains to each application level message and any other application level messages related to the each application level message (correlation information are the orders in XML format, it is being sent across the network between plurality of vendors, [0033]; [0068-0069]).

7. As per claim 2, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein the correlation information for each message includes application level message information regarding the each message (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14, wherein the message information are encoded within XML documents) and/or call information regarding a call to which the each application level message and any other related message belongs, and/or session information regarding a session to which the each application level message and any other related message belongs.

8. As per claim 3, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein the message information for each application level message includes a Hop Identifier (ID) uniquely identifying a hop between a sender and receiver of the each application level message ([0074], the identifier is in the form of XML tags, the XML tags identifies each hop between a sender and a receiver).

9. As per claim 4, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the message information for each application level message further includes an identification of the each application level message's sending service and receiving service ([0074]).

10. As per claim 5, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the message information for each application level message further includes an indication as to whether the each application level message has completed transmission (Col. 21, lines 5-10; Col. 6, lines 15-20, wherein the error detection detect the completeness of a message transmission, a transmission without error is complete).

11. As per claim 6, Ims teaches wherein the message information for each application level message further includes a reason or error log regarding why the each application level message has failed to complete its transmission if the each application level message as failed ([0092]).

12. As per claim 7, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the message information for each application level message further includes a portion of the each message content (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14).

13. As per claim 8, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 3, wherein the message information for each application level message further includes two or more of the following: an identification of the each application level message's sending and receiving service (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14), an indication as to whether the each application level message has completed transmission, a reason or error log regarding why the each message has failed to complete its transmission if the each application level message has failed ([0092]), and a portion of the each application level message content (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14), a size of the each application level message, a topic of the each application level message,

a status on processing steps taken on the each application level message, and specification of any protocols used in receiving and sending the each message ([0070-0073]).

14. As per claim 9, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein the call information for each call includes a Call Identifier (ID) uniquely identifying the each call ([0074]; [0076]).

15. As per claim 10, claim 10 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 8 above.

16. As per claim 11, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein the session information for each session includes a Session Identifier (ID) uniquely identifying the each session (transactions are uniquely identified within Ims's system, [0074]; [0076]).

17. As per claim 12, claim 12 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 5 above.

18. As per claim 13, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 11, wherein the session information for each session further includes a calculated or executed route for messages sent within the each session ([0068-0069]).

19. As per claim 14, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 11, wherein the session information for each session further includes an identity (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14) and status of each service of the each session ([0092]).

20. As per claim 15, claim 15 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 8 above.

21. As per claim 16, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein each message belongs to a particular call between two of the services ([0068-0069]).

22. As per claim 17, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein each call include a request message ([0068]) and a response message or a notification message ([0092]).

23. As per claim 18, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein a call is defined as a set of predefined application level message types ([0068-0069]).

24. As per claim 19, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein a session is determined by the services which send application level messages for the set of calls as a set of calls ([0068-0069]).

24. As per claim 20, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein at least some of services are implemented on different computer systems and at least some of these computer systems differ from a computer system which implements the message interchange network ([0068-0069]).

25. As per claim 21, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, wherein the tracking of correlating information comprises:

receiving a current application level message at the message interchange network, wherein the current application level message belong to a current session and a current call ([0068-0069]);

when the received current application level message is a first message received for the current session, assigning a session identifier for the current message (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14; [0068-0069]) and embedding the session identifier in the current message prior to forwarding it to its destination service ([0063]; [0065]; [0074]);

when the received current application level message is a first message received for the current call, assigning a call identifier for the current application level message and embedding the call identifier in the current application level message prior to forwarding it to its destination service (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14; [0068-0069]; [0063]; [0065]; [0074]);

assigning a hop identifier for the current application level message which uniquely identifies the current application level message (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14), and

associating and storing the session identifier, the call identifier, and the hop identifier, along with message information, call information, and session information for the received application level message (Appendix A.1, pg 13-14).

26. As per claim 22, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 2, further comprising:  
receiving a query for correlation information regarding a particular session or call, wherein the query is sent by a first one of the services ([0068]); and  
sending correlation information to the first service related to the particular session or call of the query ([0069]).

27. As per claim 23, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 22, wherein the correlation information includes information regarding application level messages sent between more than two services ([0068-0069]).

28. As per claim 25, Ims teaches a method as recited in claim 1, wherein at least one of the services is a routing script ([0065]; [0076]).

29. As per claims 26-33, claims 26-33 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 22, 1-3, 8-11 above respectively.

30. As per claims 34-48, claims 34-48 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claims 8, 17-21, 26, 25, 1-7 above respectively.

31. As per claims 49-50, claims 49-50 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 8-9 above respectively.

32. As per claims 51-55, claims 51-55 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 8, 11, 5,

13, 14 above respectively.

33. As per claims 56-64, 66, claims 56-64, 66 are rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim

8, 16-21, 26, 23, 25 above respectively.

34. As per claim 67, claim 67 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 26 above.

*Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

35. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

36. Claims 24, 65 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable by Ims et al. (hereinafter Ims), US 2002-0091533, in view of Picher-Dempsey, US 6,779,031.

37. As per claim 24, Ims does not explicitly teach a method as recited in claim 22, further comprising determining whether the first service is authorized to make the query and only sending correlation information to the first service when it is determined that the first service is authorized, although Ims teaches XML programming languages support appropriate security modules, see [0009], [0012] for additional details.

In a similar system, Picher-Dempsey teaches of a network monitoring system allowing only the authenticated/authorized users to make IP/QoS reservation requests (Col. 4, lines 30-50). This is done for security reasons, so that only the authenticated users may have access to the network information. Hence, it would have been obvious to the person ordinary skilled in the art to combine teachings of Ims and Picher-Dempsey because using secure authentication in a monitoring system in order to ensure

information is secure on the internet as taught by Picher-Dempsey would improve the capability of Ims's system by introducing added security.

38. As per claim 65, claim 65 is rejected for the same reasons as rejection to claim 24 above.

*Conclusion*

39. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reined of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

40. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The following patents and publications are cited to further show the state of the art with respect to "Apparatus And Methods For Correlating Message Sent Between Services".

- i. US 6529489 Kikuchi et al.
- ii. US 5255389 Wang
- iii. US 5333312 Wang
- iv. US 6091714 Sensel et al.

Art Unit: 2152

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Chad Zhong whose telephone number is (571)272-3946. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 7:15 to 4:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, BURGESS, GLENTON B can be reached on (571)272-3949. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

CZ

September 22, 2005



Dung C. Dinh  
Primary Examiner